

examination purposes only.

Applicants make no statement regarding the patentable distinctness of the species, but note that for restriction to be proper, there must be a patentable difference between the species as claimed. MPEP § 808.01(a). The Office has not provided any reasons or examples to support a conclusion that the species are indeed patentably distinct. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Restriction is improper, and Applicants' election of species is for initial examination purposes only. With respect to the elected species, Applicants respectfully request that, should the elected species be found allowable, the Office should expand its search to the non-elected species.

MPEP § 803 indicates that restriction is only proper if there is a serious burden in searching the entire application. Applicants submit that the Office has not shown that a serious burden exists in searching the entire application. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the election requirement is improper and should be withdrawn.

Applicants submit that the application is now in a condition for examination on the merits. Early notice of such is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Norman F. Oblon
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 24,618

Daniel J. Pereira, Ph.D.
Registration No. 45,518



22850

(703) 413-3000
NFO:DJP\cct